

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09518 01 OF 02 171705Z

50

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-07 H-03

INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03

SS-20 USIA-15 IO-14 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04

AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /164 W
----- 022759

R 171545Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 623

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 VIENNA 9518

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING NOVEMBER 14

REFERENCE: (A) VIENNA 9428 (B) VIENNA 9429 (C) VIENNA 9430

SUMMARY: IN AD HOC GROUP MEETING NOV 14, NETHERLANDS REP REPORTED CONVERSATION WITH SOVIET REP LATTER HAD COMPLAINED OF POLEMICAL TONE OF ALLIED STATEMENTS AND EXPRESSED SUSPICION THAT NATO HOPED TO INCREASE NATIONAL (I.E. FRG) FORCES TO COMPENSATE FOR US REDUCTIONS. BELGIAN AND CANADIAN STATEMENTS FOR NOV 15 PLENARY (SEPTELS A AND B) WERE APPROVED. THERE WAS AN EXTENDED DISCUSSION ABOUT THE APPROPRIATE STRUCTURE FOR ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL, BASED ON INCOMPATIBILITY BETWEEN UK DRAFT AS REVISED BY WORKING CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09518 01 OF 02 171705Z

GROUP AND USDRAFT STATEMENT. UK DEL HAD USED AGREED POINTS OF JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE AS THE STRUCTURE FOR THEIR DRAFT. US REP OBJECTED THAT STRUCTURING DRAFT AROUND JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE PLACED ALLIED ARGUMENTS IN ILLOGICAL SEQUENCE AND WEAKENED FORCEFULNESS OF

ALLIED PRESENTATION. GROUP REJECTED ALTERNATIVE OF TABLING ONLY BRIEFEST SUMMARY OF US DRAFT STATEMENT AS INADEQUATE RESPONSE TO A FAIRLY FORMAL SOVIET PROPOSAL. NOTING IMPORTANCE OF NEED FOR READABLE DOCUMENTS FOR SAKE OF PUBLIC OPINION, GROUP INSTRUCTED DRAFTING GROUP TO RECONVENE AND COMBINE UK AND US DRAFTS BY NOVEMBER 16 IN SUCH A WAY AS TO USE US LINE OF APPROACH BUT ADHERING TO NEUTRAL LANGUAGE EXCEPT WHERE NECESSARY TO MAKE ARGUMENT CLEAR. END SUMMARY.

1. BILATERALS-SOVIET FEAR OF NATO COMPENSATION FOR US FORCE REDUCTIONS. CHAIRMAN (ITALIAN REP AMBASSADOR CAGIATI) OPENED MEETING BY ASKING REPS TO REPORT BILATERALS. NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) REPORTED CONVERSATION WITH SOVIET REP KHLESTOV (SEE SEPTTEL) IN WHICH LATTER HAD COMPLAINED OF ALLIED REFERENCES TO OFFENSIVE CAPACITY OF WARSAW PACT FORCES AND THREATENED TO REPLY IN KIND IF WEST DID NOT REFRAIN FROM SUCH POLEMICAL LANGUAGE. UK REP REPLIED THAT ALLIES HAD ALWAYS CAREFULLY AVOIDED USING TERM "OFFENSIVE" AND THAT SOVIET REP WAS MISTAKEN AND SHOULD BE SO INFORMED. CHAIRMAN AGREED AND SUGGESTED GROUP KEEP THIS IN MIND IN DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIETS. US REP INTERJECTED THAT WHILE ALLIES SHOULD STICK WITH THEIR ANNOUNCED APPROACH OF NOT DEALING DEAL WITH INTENTIONS OF EITHER SIDE, ALLIES SHOULD NOT, HOWEVER, PLACE SELVES IN POSITION WHERE THEY COULD NOT USE THE TERM IN THE FUTURE, CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) REMARKED THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT FEAR USE OF TERM. FRG REP (BEHREND) THOUGHT OBJECTION TO WORD WAS JUST A SOVIET PRESSURE TACTIC WHICH ALLIES SHOULD RESIST, AND NOTED THAT HE HAD REPEATEDLY USED IT IN PRIVATE CONVERSATIONS WITH WARSAW PACT REPS WHO SHOWED NO ADVERSE REACTION.

2. NETHERLANDS REP CONTINUED HIS REPORT OF CONVERSATION WITH SOVIET REP. HE NOTED GREAT IMPORTANCE SOVIETS ATTACHED TO ASSURANCE THAT AMERICAN REDUCTIONS NOT BE REPLACED BY INCREASES IN OTHER NATO FORCES, PARTICULARLY FRG. SOVIET PROPOSAL, NETHERLANDS REP NOTED, DISTRIBUTED NATIONAL FORCE REDUCTIONS ACCORDING TO PREVAILING FORCE RELATIONSHIPS, WHICH MEANT THAT ALMOST HALF THE CUT ON WESTERN SIDE WOULD COME OUT OF FRG. SOVIET CONCERNS CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09518 01 OF 02 171705Z

ON THIS TOPIC SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN THE ALLIES' FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL, HE SAID. HE NOTED THAT SPC WAS CONSIDERING A PROPOSAL TO LIMIT NATO AND PACT AGGREGATE GROUND MANPOWER TO PRESENT LEVELS FROM THE OUTSET, AND COMMENTED THAT THIS WOULD MEET SOVIET FEARS. US DEPREP REPLIED THAT WHILE AN EARLY CEILING ON FRG FORCES WAS CERTAINLY DESIRED BY THE SOVIETS, THERE WAS NO REASON WHY THE ALLIES SHOULD FEEL OBLIGED TAKE ACCOUNT OF THIS DESIRE AT THIS POINT IN PRESENTING THEIR POSITION AND GOOD TACTICAL REASONS WHY THEY SHOULD NOT DO SO. NETHERLANDS REP VOICED FEAR THAT IF ALLIES DELAY TOO LONG IN MENTIONING THE ISSUE, IT COULD STRENGTHEN SOVIET SUSPICION THAT EUROPEAN ALLIES ARE PLANNING TO COMPENSATE FOR US REDUCTIONS IN ONE WAY OR ANOTHER. US DEPREP REPLIED THAT ALLIES KNEW THAT FRG LIMITATION

WAS ONE OF THINGS SOVIETS WANTED MOST, BUT IF THEY GOT IT AT ALL, IT SHOULD BE AT THE END, NOT THE BEGINNING, OF THE CONFERENCE.

3. FRG REP REPORTED THAT CZECHOSLOVAKIAN AND ROMANIAN REPS WOULD SPEAK AT NOV 15 PLENARY, AND ASKED WHETHER THEY SHOULD FOLLOW CANADIAN AND BELGIAN REPS. (EASTERN CHAIRMEN IN LAST TWO PLENARIES HAVE GIVEN FLOOR FIRST TO THEIR ALLIES.) US DEPREP SAID ON THIS OCCASION IT DID NOT MATTER IN PRINCIPLE WHETHER ALLIES SPOKE FIRST OR SECOND BUT THAT PETTY ADVANTAGES SHOULD NOT BE TAKEN BY CHAIRMEN. CHAIRMAN SUGGESTED THAT NEXT TIME ALLIES CAN ASK EASTERN SIDE A WEEK IN ADVANCE WHICH ORDER THEY PREFER. CANADIAN REP NOTED THAT IN FUTURE THE BELGIAN-POLISH CHANNEL SHOULD BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE.

4. GROUP THEN CONSIDERED DRAFT BELGIAN AND CANADIAN STATEMENTS, WHICH WERE ADOPTED WITH MINOR EDITORIAL CHANGES (SEPTELS A AND B). CANADIAN REP (GRANDE), NOTING CONTINUED USE OF HEADING ON BELGIAN STATEMENT "FOR CONFERENCE USE" AS PREVIOUSLY AGREED BY AD HOC GROUP, REMARKED THAT EAST DOES NOT PUT HEADING OF THIS KIND ON THEIR PAPERS AND QUESTIONED WHETHER ALLIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO DO SO. GROUP AGREED TO RETAIN HEADING IN ORDER TO DEMONSTRATE ALLIED ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLE OF CONFIDENTIALITY.

5. FRG REP (BEHREND) REPORTED ON VITUPERATIVE RADIO COMMENT ON MBFR CARRIED ON EAST GERMAN RADIO WHICH CHARACTERIZED DELEGATES AS "POKER-PLAYERS" AND "REACTIONARIES" AND SPOKE OF "GROWING STRENGTH OF SOCIALIST STATES" AS BEST GUARANTEE OF PEACE, ETC. IT WAS HARDLY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE SPIRIT OF MBFR, AND HE IN-CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09518 01 OF 02 171705Z

TENDED TO COMPLAIN TO EASTERN DELS.

6. DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUP DRAFT OUTLINE OF WESTERN PROPOSAL. UK DEP REP (GOODALL) WHO CHAIRED DRAFTING GROUP REPORTED THAT GROUP FOUND IT DIFFICULT TO WORK ON BASIS OF TWO DRAFTS OF THE OUTLINE OR MEMORANDUM WHICH WOULD BE INTRODUCED BY THE US DRAFT STATEMENT. THE DRAFTING GROUP HAD REVIEWED THE BRITISH DRAFT, BUT HAD NOT HAD TIME TO WORK ON THE AMERICAN DRAFT. HE CONTINUED THAT THE NEW WORKING GROUP DRAFT AND THE AMERICAN DRAFT WERE BASICALLY INCOMPATIBLE BECAUSE, WHILE THE FORMER CONFORMS CLOSELY TO AGREED POINTS OF THE JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE, THE AMERICAN DRAFT WAS DESIGNED FOR A WIDER AUDIENCE AND PUBLIC OPINION, AND CONTAINED MORE ARGUMENTS AND JUSTIFICATIONS FOR THE ALLIED FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL. HE NOTED TWO BRACKETED PASSAGES IN THE WORKING GROUP DRAFT: ONE WAS OVER WHETHER TO QUOTE FROM THE JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE AT OUTSET, AND ONE WHERE THE DRAFTING GROUP HAD BEEN UNABLE TO REACH A CONSENSUS BECAUSE OF OBJECTIONS BY THE FLANK COUNTRIES. US REP EXPLAINED THAT US DRAFT HAD BEEN PREPARED WITH A VIEW THAT IT BE USED AS BASIC DRAFT AND QUESTIONED WHETHER A SECOND DOCUMENT WAS NEEDED AT ALL. US PRESENTATION COULD READILY BE RECAST IN FORM OF MEMORANDUM FOR TABLING IF THAT WAS DESIRE OF

GROUP. A SECOND PAPER WOULD BE USEFUL ONLY IF IT STRENGTHENED ALLIED CASE. ALLIES SHOULD NOT FALL INTO TRAP OF TRYING BLINDLY TO IMITATE EAST. CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT PROVISION FOR PRESENTATION OF SECOND DOCUMENT WAS IN NATO GUIDELINES, BUT US DEPREP NOTED THAT GUIDELINES DID NOT SPECIFY MEMORANDUM FORM.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 VIENNA 09518 02 OF 02 171720Z

50

ACTION ACDA-19

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 IO-14 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 AEC-11 OMB-01

DRC-01 /160 W

----- 022780

R 171545Z NOV 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 624

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USMISSION NATO

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USMMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 VIENNA 9518

MBFR NEGOTIATIONS

FROM US REP MBFR

7. US REP SUGGESTED THAT SIMPLEST SOLUTION WOULD BE BARE OUTLINE OF TERMS, AS CONTAINED AT END OF US DRAFT, AND WHICH WOULD ALSO MEET SUGGESTION OF FRG REP NOVEMBER 13. IF THERE IS TO BE SECOND DOCUMENT, IT SHOULD BE IN SUCH FORM. CHAIRMAN THEN REMARKED THAT THIS WAS IN EFFECT A THIRD CHOICE AND THAT THE POSSIBILITIES APPEARED TO BE A DRAFT BASED ON WORKING GROUP DRAFT BASED ON UK PAPER, US DRAFT, OR SUMMARY. US REP EXPLAINED FURTHER THAT THE FULL EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BASED ON THE US DRAFT SHOULD BE USED IN ANY CASE AND THAT THE SHORT DOCUMENT SHOULD FOLLOW THE SAME LOGIC AND DEVELOPMENT AS THE COVERING STATEMENT TO BE MOST COMPELLING AND NOT CONFUSE SOVIET SIDE. US DRAFT FOLLOWED LOGIC OF DISCUSSIONS OF PAST THREE WEEKS. NEW WORKING GROUP DRAFT, ON OTHER HAND, ATTEMPTED TO RELATE EVERYTHING TO AGREED PRINCIPLES OF JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE, RESULTING IN DISTORTIONS OF LOGIC OF PRESENTA-
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 09518 02 OF 02 171720Z

TION AND WEAKENING OF PRESENTATION. FOR EXAMPLE, "COMMON CEILING" WAS PUT FORWARD UNDER "FORCES TO BE REDUCED" AND ITS RATIONALE WAS NOT EXPLAINED IN THE DRAFT, NO FIGURES WERE GIVEN FOR TANKS, GEOGRAPHIC DISPARITY WAS MENTIONED, BUT NOT ITS SOLUTION, AND THE DRAFT MENTIONED A SOVIET TANK ARMY WITHOUT NOTING THAT THIS IS 15 PERCENT OF THE SOVIET FORCES, A FIGURE WHICH IS THE BASIS FOR PROPOSED FIFTEEN PERCENT REDUCTION OF US FORCES. PERHAPS IT WOULD BE BETTER TO RETURN TO FRG REP'S SUGGESTION OF SIMPLE OUTLINE.

8. CHAIRMAN EXPRESSED THOUGHT THAT A TWO-PAGE SUMMARY WOULD NOT APPEAR IN THE EYES OF PUBLIC OPINION TO BE A SERIOUS PROPOSAL, TO WHICH US REP REPLIED THAT LONG AND SHORT VERSIONS COULD BE PREPARED, THE FORMER FOR PUBLIC USE IF IT WERE DECIDED TO GO PUBLIC. UK REP ASSERTED THAT AHG WAS COMMITTED TO A SECOND DOCUMENT AND NOTED THAT AHG WHICH REPORTED TO NAC IN BRUSSELS NOV 9 LEFT NAC WITH UNDERSTANDING THAT FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL INVOLVED BE TABLED IN MEMORANDUM FORM. BEFORE DROPPING MEMORANDUM FORM, IT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO INFORM NAC AND GIVE REASONS. US DEPREP NOTED THAT THIS PROBLEM COULD BE SOLVED MERELY BY PUTTING TITLE "MEMORANDUM" AT HEAD OF THE LONGER STATEMENT. FRG REP PRAISED LOGIC AND PRESENTATION OF US DOCUMENT BUT SAID IT WAS INSUFFICIENTLY RIGOROUSLY STRUCTURED TO BE REGARDED AS FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL, AND A SEPARATE MEMORANDUM SHOULD BE PREPARED.

9. BELGIAN ACTG REP (WILLOT) SAID THAT IN FACE OF SPECIFIC WRITTEN SOVIET PROPOSAL, ALLIES SHOULD HAVE A SHORTER AND SPECIFIC DOCUMENT TO TABLE AS A COUNTERPROPOSAL OR RISK BEING FORCED TO NEGOTIATE ON BASIS OF THE SOVIET PROPOSAL, WHICH WAS WHAT SOVIETS DESIRED. ALLIES COULD CALL THEIR PROPOSAL AN "OUTLINE," BUT IT WOULD BE PRESENTED AS A PROPOSAL. THERE WERE TWO DIFFICULTIES, HE CONTINUED: A MERE SUMMARY PROPOSAL LOOKED RATHER STARK AND GAVE THE IMPRESSION OF A SLAP IN THE FACE. THIS IMPRESSION WOULD HAVE TO BE EASED BY LENGTHENING IT. ALSO, IF THE OTHER SIDE LEAKED SOVIET PROPOSAL, ALLIES WOULD BE CAUGHT WITH ONLY AN OUTLINE. DRAFTING GROUP HAD CAREFULLY WEIGHED EVERY WORD IN UK DRAFT, WHICH NOW WAS EXCELLENT PRODUCT WHICH SHOULD BE ACCEPTED. CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) INSISTED IT WAS NECESSARY TO TABLE A FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL, AND IT COULD BE IN THE FORM OF A MEMORANDUM. ONE COULD ALWAYS DRAW ON US DOCUMENT LATER.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 09518 02 OF 02 171720Z

10. NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) SAID AHG HAD BEEN INSTRUCTED TO TABLE AN OUTLINE PROPOSAL, AND ISSUE WAS MERELY HOW TO DRESS IT UP. AHG HAD THREE CHOICES: US DRAFT, WORKING GROUP DRAFT, OR SUMMARY OF WESTERN PROPOSAL. PUBLIC OPINION WAS IMPORTANT AND ALLIES MUST HAVE A READABLE DOCUMENT. HE DOUBTED THAT PRESENT COURSE OF BUILDING DRAFT AROUND JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE WAS WISE. PRESENTATION OF US PROPOSAL HIT EYE AND ITS LOGIC WAS GOOD. UK SHOULD IN-

CORPORATE SOME OF AMERICAN LOGIC INTO ITS DRAFT. TWO DOCUMENTS -- STATEMENT AND A SHORTER PAPER FOR TABLING -- WERE NECESSARY. CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT LARGE MAJORITY OF GROUP FAVORED PRESENTATION OF TABLED DOCUMENT AND QUESTION WAS WHETHER UK OR US LINE SHOULD BE FOLLOWED. US DEP REP SAID US DRAFT HAD TRIED TO MAKE MOST COMPELLING CASE POSSIBLE BOTH FOR PUBLIC OPINION AND FOR SOVIETS. UK DRAFT BROKE FLOW OF WESTERN CASE IN CONTORTED SEQUENCE. HE REGRETTED THAT AHG HAD NOT FIRST REVIEWED TIGHTLY KNIT ARGUMENTATION IN US DRAFT STATEMENT, BECAUSE PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION OF GENERAL APPROACH WOULD HAVE PROVIDED BETTER GUIDANCE FOR WORKING GROUP.

11. UK REP SAID HE DID NOT WANT TO DISCUSS WHICH DOCUMENT WAS BEFORE AHG FIRST. WORKING GROUP DRAFT FOLLOWED LINE OF OPENING STATEMENT IN CITING JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE. UK HAD TRIED TO RELATE ARGUMENTS WITH AGREED PRINCIPLES AND THEREFORE WROTE THEM THE SAME WAY AS EARLIER STATEMENTS HAD BEEN CAST. ALL THE UK DID WAS SUPPLY LINK PHRASES TO SHOW HOW THEY WERE RELATED TO PROPOSALS ADVANCED. IT HAD BEEN AGREED AT NOVEMBER 13 MEETING OF AHG THAT DRAFT WAS TO BE "NEUTRAL" AND HE CITED HOW PREVIOUS DRAFT PASSAGES, WHICH HAD BALDLY STATED DISPARITIES FAVORING WARSAW PACT, HAD NOW BEEN REPHRASED TO INDICATE SAME IDEA ONLY BY INFERENCE. AMERICAN DRAFT, ON OTHER HAND, MADE NO PRETENSE AT BEING ANYTHING BUT ONE-SIDED ARGUMENT.

12. CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT MAIN POINTS OF ALLIED PROPOSAL, I.E., CONCENTRATION ON GROUND FORCES AND US/SOVIET REDUCTIONS WERE NOT WELL PRESENTED IN WORKING GROUP DRAFT BECAUSE IT STUCK SO CLOSELY TO FORMAT BASED ON SECTIONS FROM JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE. IF JUNE 28 COMMUNIQUE DOES NOT SERVE TO MAKE THESE TWO CENTRAL POINTS, THEN AHG SHOULD NOT ADHERE TO IT. HE SUGGESTED THAT WORKING GROUP RECONVENE TO COMBINE BOTH US AND UK DRAFTS, SINCE MANY PARAGRAPHS VIRTUALLY IDENTICAL AND MERELY IN DIFFERENT ORDER. NETHERLANDS, FRG, AND CANADIAN REPS AGREED WITH CHAIRMAN.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 VIENNA 09518 02 OF 02 171720Z

13. UK REP NOTED THAT WORKING GROUP WOULD NEED GUIDANCE ON WHETHER TO USE ARGUMENTATIVE LANGUAGE. BELGIAN ACTG REP SAID ISSUE WAS BETWEEN PRESENTATION DESIGNED AS BASIS FOR NEGOTIATIONS AND PRESENTATION DESIGNED TO CONVINCE, WHICH WERE QUITE DIFFERENT. CHAIRMAN SAID PRESENTATION COULD BE ONE DESIGNED FOR NEGOTIATION AND AVOIDING ARGUMENTATIVE TONE, BUT STILL MAINTAIN ELEMENTS OF EXPLANATION AND JUSTIFICATION. UK DEP REP ASKED FOR FURTHER GUIDANCE ON USE OF ARGUMENTATIVE LANGUAGE AND GROUP CONSENSUS WAS THAT NEUTRAL LANGUAGE BE USED WHEREEVER MEANING NOT DISTORTED. UK DEP REP COMPLAINED THAT ON ONE HAND WORKING GROUP WAS BEING TOLD TO KEEP ARGUMENTATIVE LANGUAGE AND ON OTHER HAND TO LEAVE IT OUT. US DEP REP SAID EXPERIMENT OF CASTING DRAFT OF FRAMEWORK OF COMMUNIQUE OF JUNE 28 HAD BEEN TRIED AT SOME COST IN TIME AND THE RESULT HAD BEEN FOUND INADEQUATE. UK DEP REP ASKED IF THAT MEANT INTRODUCTIONS COULD BE TAKEN FROM COMMUNIQUE WHERE RELEVANT. US DEP REP REPLIED THAT ONE SHOULD DRAW ON

COMMUNIQUE FOR SUPPORTING ARGUMENTS BUT SHOULD NOT CONSTRUCT
PAPER AROUND IT. CHAIRMAN NOTED REASONING BEHIND LARGE DIFFERENCE
BETWEEN REDUCTION OF 68,000 SOVIET TROOPS AND ONLY 29,000
AMERICANS WOULD HAVE TO BE EXPLAINED CAREFULLY IN DRAFT.

14. AHG AGREED THAT WORKING GROUP WOULD COMBINE US AND UK
DRAFTS FOR CONSIDERATION BY AHG AT ITS NEXT MEETING NOVEMBER 16.
HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 12 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS, NEGOTIATIONS, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 17 NOV 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: mcintyresh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA09518
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19731168/abqcelnj.tel
Line Count: 335
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION ACDA
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 7
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: (A) VIENNA 9428 (B) VIENNA 9429 (C) VIENNA 9430
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: mcintyresh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 16 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <16-Jul-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <23-Aug-2001 by mcintyresh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR NEGOTIATIONS: AD HOC GROUP MEETING NOVEMBER 14
TAGS: PARM, NATO, MBFR
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO NATO
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005